given me by the Author Mr Portland

11869 ff. 86.

AN

APOLOGY

TO

JOHN RICHARDSON, Esq.

Of the MIDDLE TEMPLE, and of WADHAM COLLEGE, OXFORD.

BRITISH MUSEUM
24 NOV 53

AN

APOLOGY, &c.

I Had ſcarcely finiſhed a prior defence; when the preſent Treatiſe made its appearance, in which are ſome ſtrictures of a different nature upon me, and my work. This is by no means like the former a dry and ſcholaſtic buſineſs; the offſpring of a dull grammarian: but a compoſition highly coloured and embelliſhed: abounding with tropes and figures, and enriched with a multiplicity of learning: ſo that we are bewildered in the variety of entertainment. The author's purpoſe is to give an account of the languages, literature, and manners of eaſtern people. And he ſeems in many inſtances to have copied the lively turn of thoſe nations; for he does not confine himſelf to that unneceſſary grammatical exactneſs, to which we generally think ourſelves bound to attend: nor is he a ſlave to that rigid and logical method of reaſoning; which has prevailed among us for ſome time. In ſhort he does not ſcruple to expatiate freely, and to deviate ſometimes from the ſubject matter, whenever new views open; and his fancy is caught by freſh appearances.

He has been led to think from an unfortunate line in my firſt volume, that I have ſpoken

irreverently of the Perſic and Arabic languages; for which he very juſtly entertains a great eſteem. On this account ſome pages in his Treatiſe are taken up with ſhewing me my great miſtake: but chiefly (what may not appear altogether to the purpoſe) with pointing out many fundamental errours in the hiſtorical part of my own writings. The nature of my offence in its full extent cannot be better deſcribed than in his own words. *Among other learned men, who apparently from an idea of their modern date have diſputed the utility of the Arabic and Perſian languages, is the ingenious author of the New Syſtem, or Analyſis of Ancient Mythology: a work, in which the novel ingenuity of the Analytic Syſtem, the penetration, and judgment diſplayed in the refutation of vulgar errors, with the new and informing light, in which he has placed a number of ancient facts, leaves the learned world the regret, that this claſſical writer had not to his ſingular knowledge in the Greek and Roman literature, added ſome tincture of the languages and learning of the eaſt. As there however appears an impropriety in any perſon's condemning, what he confeſſedly does not underſtand: and as this learned Gentleman has attacked a province, which I conceive it my duty to defend; I ſhall endeavour to remove ſome prejudices, which he may have created: as the errors of a writer of uncommon abilities, who has laid down canons for future hiſtory, may have a more dangerous tendency, than the miſtakes of inferiour men: whom few read: and ſtill fewer follow.* Diſſert. p. 87. All this, I muſt confeſs, is very humane and polite. We ſee here attributed to me, learning, penetration, judgment; attended with much informing light; and a particular degree of knowledge in the Greek, and Roman languages: and at the cloſe I am repreſented as a perſon of abilities. Though I cannot pretend

to

to deſerve one half of what is here ſaid, yet I ought to think myſelf greatly obliged to this gentleman for his candour and good opinion: and ſhall be ſorry to find any thing, as I proceed, that may leſſen the obligation.

The great miſtake, which entitled me to his obſervations conſiſted *in my condemning what I did not underſtand; and in attacking a province, which he thought it his duty to defend:* in ſhort *in having diſputed the utility of the Perſian and Arabic languages.* He therefore thought it neceſſary *to remove ſome of the prejudices, which I had created.* In anſwer to this I can only ſay, that I am ready to recant every thing, which I have unduly aſſerted, when he ſhall ſtate to me my unfair courſe of reaſoning. I ſhall gladly make an apology: and give the utmoſt ſatisfaction; if ſatisfaction can be given. But let all thoſe expreſſions be firſt brought together, the whole proceſs of my argument, wherein I have diſputed the utility of theſe tongues, and condemned them. I mention this, becauſe they muſt neceſſarily have been very copious to have cauſed this alarm. This is the great point, to which we are to attend: and this being ſatisfactorily diſcloſed, I am ready to make due ſubmiſſion. Let us then attend to what immediately follows, that we may ſee, how theſe articles are made out.——*The chief points, which Mr. Bryant means to eſtabliſh* (in his Analyſis) *are, Firſt the univerſality of the Deluge from Gentile authorities: Secondly the migration from Babel &c.: and Thirdly the Arkite ceremonials with the general worſhip of the ſun and fire.* I ſhall not here diſpute, whether theſe are the only great points, which I had in view: all that at preſent I ſhould be glad to know, is, how this is to the purpoſe. I am accuſed of having treated Perſic and Arabic lite-

rature irreverently: of condemning, what I did not know; and raiſing undue prejudices; and it is natural to expect ſome proof of theſe crimes. But the author ſeems to have forgot himſelf: and inſtead of bringing any evidence in ſupport of his allegations, turns aſide; and ſets about an examen of my work. But what ſupport can this poſſibly bring to his cauſe? What relation can the univerſality of the deluge, or the hiſtory of the Arkite rites, have to the utility and excellence of any language upon earth? But herein I may perhaps be too ſhort-ſighted: and he will probably tell me, if I had looked with any accuracy, I might have perceived at the end of the paragraph a ſmall directing letter, which refers to the notes: and upon turning to them, I might have obtained what I wanted. I accordingly do turn; and at laſt find the unfortunate lines, which have brought upon me theſe animadverſions. They are as follow. *In our progreſs to obtain this knowledge* (of ancient mythology) *we muſt have recourſe to the writers of Greece. It is in vain to talk about the Arabian and Perſic literature of modern date*, &c. Here we may ſee the full extent of my fault: to which with grief I muſt ſubſcribe. This is the whole; and indeed ſomewhat more: on which account with due permiſſion we will ſtrike out the et cætera at the cloſe: at it may induce readers to imagine, that there are other circumſtances left behind, which out of candour are not mentioned. We will therefore make the ſentence conclude with a full ſtop, juſt where it properly leaves off: for all, that follows, is foreign to the preſent purpoſe. —*It is in vain to talk about the Arabian or Perſic literature of modern date.* From theſe few untoward words the author has been led to affirm, that I *diſputed the utility of theſe languages*: that I

have

have condemned them; and raiſed *prejudices* againſt them. In this I am apt to think, that he goes too far. To ſay the truth I have a great opinion of the Arabian language: and the Perſic may have equal merit. I only venture to ſurmiſe that they are not of ſo great antiquity, as the Grecian: and that the modern Perſic cannot ſo ſurely lead us to the cognizance of ancient facts, as the early Greek. And if I am under a miſtake, I believe, that ninety nine out of an hundred will be found in the ſame predicament. And here, if I might do it without offence, I would beg to be informed, why my words are not introduced in the text. My accuſation ſtands manifeſt and at large; and is brought immediately under the eye of the reader. But the paſſage, upon which the whole depends, is placed out of ſight in the rear; and can be obtained only by reference. The author probably perceived upon recollection, that no ſuch inferences could be drawn from the premiſes: and that my words did not warrant ſuch a bill of attainder. He has therefore kept them cautiouſly out of ſight. And though ſome perhaps may think, that he has not acted quite fair: yet he has certainly by this manœuvre diſplayed great judgment. The only defect, that I can find, is, his forgetting the promiſed proceſs. For after he has ſtated his allegations, and has prepared us for his vindication of the injured languages, the whole ſlips out of his mind, and is turned, as I have ſhewn, into an attack upon my writings in general. Now I am ſo ſhort-ſighted, that were all that I have written to be obliterated, every letter cancelled, I cannot conceive, how it could at all vindicate the Arabic language; or be a defence to the Perſic. It is ſaid of his friends the Tatars or Tartars, that if they kill a man, they think, they ſhall inherit his

good qualities. But whether the demolition of one character will prove the ſupport of another I much queſtion. But as he is pleaſed to put things upon this iſſue, I will carefully follow, where he leads; and quitting the cauſe of the Orientals attend to what he ſays of my work. His comment begins in this manner. *The chief points, which Mr. B. wants to eſtabliſh, are, Firſt, the univerſality of the Deluge from Gentile authorities. Secondly the migration after the Babel diſperſion of the people, whom he calls Cuthites, or Amonians.* Every body without doubt has a right to canvas, what I have written: and they have my full leave to paſs ſentence accordingly. But there is one thing previous, which with ſubmiſſion I think ſhould be required: and this is, that they read, before they comment; and underſtand, before they condemn. For to be ſure, my kind opponent hath caſt his eye rather ſuperficially over my work; and excepting in ſome inſtances, where he has borrowed, he does not ſeem to be ſo fully maſter of the ſubject, as I could have wiſhed. In reſpect to my eſtabliſhing the univerſality of the Deluge upon Gentile authority, I do not recollect, that this was my ſtated purpoſe. It is upon the authority of the Scriptures, that I found this hiſtory: which Scriptures I quote at large. By Gentile evidence I illuſtrate the ſame; and bring additional proof to its confirmation. As to the *migration* of the Cuthites *after the Babel diſperſion*, I fear the whole is here miſapprehended; and, as the poet ſays, *confuſion is worſe confounded.* The Cuthites were the very people of the diſperſion: and the *migration* was a different event, antecedent to the other, which the author makes ſubſequent. The Amonians, of whom he ſpeaks, were collectively the offſpring of Amon, the ſame as Ham. Why does he limit

limit the title to the Cuthites, who were one branch only; when it related to the whole family? It is true, that I admire his vivacity, and quickneſs in deciding, though I ſmart for it. Yet it is a pity, as he teems with words even to a degree of ſuperfœtation, that he is not as curious as abundant.

The third point, into which he divides my work, conſiſts of the *Arkite rites* with the *worſhip of fire*. How truly this is laid down, I ſhall not here conteſt. Let us attend to his obſervations upon theſe heads: and firſt upon the proofs of the Deluge. — *With regard to the firſt great event, I ſhall only obſerve in general, that the departing from the ſacred writings to prove the deſtruction of mankind by pagan authorities, however laudable the intention, ſeems firſt to ſhake to the foundations the venerable fabrick, and then to prop it with a bullruſh.* This is ſpoken ſo determinately, that I have hardly courage to make an anſwer. Thus much I muſt ſay, in reſpect to the fabrick mentioned, that nobody has a greater veneration for the old building than I have. But I am ſo backward of perception, that I cannot for the life of me ſee, how my departing from an edifice can thus ſhake it to its baſis. The idea is noble and pleaſing: yet I cannot conceive how merely retiring can be attended with ſuch a convulſive influence. But in truth I never depart from the Scriptures. I have diligently abode by them, and will ever abide. But I ſtill think, with ſubmiſſion, that we may afford them both illuſtration and ſupport from writers of other countries: for I know not how to ſet aſide as uſeleſs all collateral evidence. For the truth of the aphoriſm does not ſeem to me ſelf-evident, that the uſing of foreign authorities is *propping with a bullruſh*. The author however ſubjoins the following

lowing argument to ſupport it. *For when recourſe is had to feeble and imperfect evidence, a cauſe muſt be ever hurt in proportion to its failure.* This is clearly urged without the leaſt equivocation. I believe, no oracle from the Tripod was ever more certain. But I fear upon examination we ſhall be found rather to beg the queſtion. The ſubject is about our admitting of foreign evidence: now I ſuſpect, that it will not be allowed us to ſuppoſe that, it is neceſſarily *feeble and imperfect.* We muſt read, learn, and diſtinguiſh, and then much good may reſult. External helps muſt not therefore be univerſally diſallowed as uſeleſs: for at this rate we ſhall be obliged to inſiſt, that the more light we obtain, the worſe we ſee: and the more copious the evidence the weaker the proof. The author however proceeds to ſet aſide all foreign authorities, which he terms Pagan: and endeavours to ſhew the abſurdity of thoſe perſons, who have made application to ſuch means. Yet writers of this ſort have been very numerous, and ſome of them of tolerable repute, from Clemens and Tertullian down to Grotius, and Le Clerc. To theſe might be added the Cudworths, Stillingfleets, Pearſons, Cumberlands, Uſhers, Marſhams, Spencers, Newtons, with ſome others of our own nation; people, who in general have been well ſpoken of. Yet their method of reaſoning is not thought juſt; and for the following reaſons. *As if truth wanted the aid of fiction innumerable have been the attempts of the learned to eſtabliſh by forced and unnatural conſtructions a conformity between the early hiſtory of the Hebrews, and the later fables of Greece, Egypt, and other ancient nations. From the fragments of Beroſus, Abydenus, Sanchoniathon, Manetho, and other remote fablers, any thing, and every thing, may be drawn, which a lively imagination can ſuggeſt. But*

the

the working up ſuch ſtrange materials into any circumſtance deſcriptive of Noah's deluge ſhews a warmth of fancy highly prepared for the reception of every thing marvellous. Whilſt giving them all their utmoſt force, they prove at laſt preciſely Nothing.—For ingenious men, if reſolved to apply to profane materials in ſupport of Scripture, ought to go to mountainous diſtricts, and to countries far removed from the poſſibility of natural inundations. They ought to conſider Hindoſtan, and other quarters of the world, where they poſitively refuſe to believe this important era. Teſtimonies from ſuch regions would be far more concluſive than hundreds of volumes from Egypt and Chaldea. This is deciſive work; and doing buſineſs to ſome purpoſe: yet I do not quite ſee the force of the argument. As to going to Hindoſtan, and to the other parts, which are mentioned; I cannot agree to it, and muſt beg to be excuſed: for it is a great deal too far. Indeed why ſhould I take ſuch a journey; when he confeſſes, there is no intelligence to be had, when I get there. I am ſent in queſt of Pagan materials; and it does not appear, that there is a ſhred or atom to be obtained. Ingenious men are particularly ſpecified: but as to ingenuity I ſhould think it quite ſuperfluous. The dulleſt emiſſary, that ever was employed, would be too good upon ſuch an expedition: for whatever pittance he carried out, he would bring juſt ſo much home, and no more. But, as I ſaid before, I do not perceive the force of this argument, which is founded upon the diſbelief of the Aſiatics. There is towards the moſt ſouthern point of Africa an high eminence, called the Table Mountain: and in Ceylon a high hill in the province of Conde Uda. If we were to aſk a Caffre or a Cingaleſe of theſe parts about an univerſal deluge, they would probably, as the author

ingeniouſly

ingeniouſly expreſſes it, *refuſe to believe this important era:* that is, in other words, they would be found to know nothing of the matter. This would undoubtedly be the caſe: yet I do not know how to think, that ſuch diſſent is quite ſufficient to ſet aſide any event, with which others may be better acquainted. We will grant, that the people in Hindoſtan do not believe this event. The reaſon is becauſe they have no preciſe and authentic traditions about it: And the author mentions other people in the ſame ſituation. And he thinks this diſbelief ſo cogent and convincing, that he would have ingenious men go to theſe countries for information. He looks upon this diſbelief, when repeated, as a poſitive proof: and ſtiles it in the plural teſtimonies. *Such teſtimonies*, ſays he, that is (what may at firſt appear a little ſtrange) teſtimony without any evidence; or (if I might be allowed ſo to explain the term) ſuch ignorance, *would be far more concluſive than hundreds of volumes from Egypt and Chaldea.* Many will think, that this is rating diſbelief too high. Indeed, the author ſeems to ſhew the ſame veneration for ignorance, as the Turks do for folly: who never ſee an ideot, but they think him inſpired.

The mode of reaſoning above is curious, but not new. The celebrated Mr. Hume in his elaborate diſcourſe againſt miracles, follows it throughout: and his ſyſtem is built upon it. In reſpect to paſt facts upon record he makes our not experiencing any thing analogous, either one way or the other, the ſame as our experiencing the direct contrary: and he enhances, what is a mere negative to poſitive knowledge. He aſſures us, that this argument will be of ſervice as long as the world endures: and moreover that it is all his own. The latter part of his aſſertion I will

not

not pretend to diſpute: nor do I know of any one that would rob him of the honour. As to any utility I confeſs, that I cannot perceive it. And though I am ſenſible, that ſome people have been alarmed: yet I think the argument quite innocent. It cannot poſſibly do any good: and I truſt it will as certainly do no harm.

It is remarkable, that in the paſſage above about the deluge the author ſpeaks of people's not believing *the important era.* Now there are perſons in the world, who may think, that there is ſomething artful in this manner of expreſſion. They may imagine, that it is uſed by way of ſubterfuge, that if he ſhould be hard preſſed about this hiſtory, there might be ſome room to eſcape. For many people doubt about the time of an occurrence; and yet believe the event. But this is an idle ſurmiſe: and we may fairly acquit the author of any ſuch mean purpoſe. It is plain at firſt ſight, that he takes the fact, and the *era* of the fact, for one and the ſame thing: and time and circumſtance are eſteemed ſynonymous. It is certain (I know not how truly) that we are apt in general to make a material diſtinction between them. We are taught to think, that an event, and the date of the event, convey two diſtinct ideas. Whichever ſide may be in the right, the inquiry is certainly curious: and deſerves to be proſecuted. To be therefore certain of the truth, I applied to an honeſt countryman, one Sam Joel, in my neighbourhood, that I might have, not a learned, but a plain and rational ſolution of the queſtion. Pray, ſays I, honeſt Sam, do not you believe, that there is ſome difference between a man and a month: between ſheepſhearing and the tenth of June? Why really, Sir, ſays he, I do not quite ſee, what you drive at. Why then, ſays I, take it in another light. Do not you think

think my Lord Mayor is different from my Lord Mayor's day? Ay maſter, ſays he, to be ſure: as different as a townbull from a turnip. I mention this, becauſe I think arguments taken from unſophiſticated reaſon are far more forcible, than thoſe which are framed by art and logic: and even than thoſe, which are founded upon non-experience.

The author in ſpeaking of Beroſus, Manetho, and other ancient writers, treats them as mere romancers: and ſays, that their evidence concerning the Deluge *amounts to preciſely nothing*. Even Strabo and Diodorus are eſteemed little better, than the authors of the Arabian Tales. Now I muſt confeſs, that before this impeachment of their credibility, I had a great prejudice in their favour: and thought, that much light might be derived from their hiſtories. When I read in Beroſus, that there had been a juſt perſon, much favoured by the Deity, who was forewarned of a deluge: and at the ſame time ordered to build a large ark or float: that he accordingly conſtructed ſuch a machine, and incloſed in it his family together with animals of every denomination: that the flood came; and the ark for a ſeaſon was lifted up by the waters: that this perſon at times ſent out birds to know the ſtate of the earth: that ſome of them returned in the ſame manner as they went out, having found no *reſting place for their feet*: others at laſt came home with their feet ſtained with ooze; which afforded him knowledge, that the waters were in ſome degree ſubſided: that the ark at laſt ſettled upon a high mountain in Armenia, where the perſons incloſed firſt made their exit: and from whence ſome of them came afterwards to Babylonia: I ſay, when I read theſe occurrences, I could not help thinking, but that this account was very ſimilar to the deſcription given by Moſes; and that it afforded ſtrong evi-

dence to the truth of that hiſtory. But the Author has before obſerved, that whoever *departs* from the ſacred writings, and adopts *Pagan authorities* muſt neceſſarily *ſhake the venerable fabrick to its foundations.* He moreover aſſures us, that this Babyloniſh hiſtory muſt amount to nothing: for Babylonia was a flat, and liable to inundations.

In like manner when I conſidered the accounts given of Oſiris, they affected me a good deal. He is ſaid to have been a great huſbandman, and to have taught people to ſow corn, and to have been the inventor of the plough. He firſt planted the vine; and made drink of the juice of the grape; and was eſteemed an univerſal benefactor. It is ſaid of him, that he was ſhut up in an ark to avoid a deluge; and the days of his ingreſs and egreſs were celebrated by the Egyptians at different parts of the year, and held very ſacred. The time of his entering into the ark was preciſely on the ſixteenth day of the ſecond month after the autumnal equinox, when the ſun was in Scorpio: at the ſeaſon, when the days are decreaſing, and the nights growing long. Theſe events were commemorated at different places: and Oſiris was repreſented in a boat; and thus carried about in proceſſion. As this hiſtory coincides in ſo many particulars with the account given by Moſes, it appeared to me of great conſequence. But the learned author ſets it intirely aſide: for he ſays, that Egypt was all a flat, and liable to inundations: and we cannot write with any degree of probability about a flood in a country, which is liable to be overflowed. He adds farther, *To advance—as proofs of an univerſal deluge ſuch ceremonies, as the proceſſions of Egyptian prieſts with a boat and a ſtrange figure, appears to be as unſatisfactory, as the demonſtration of a general deſtruction by fire would have been from obſervations in the environs of Mount Veſuvius and Ætna.*

This

This ſeems to be well urged: and yet I am afraid it makes for the other ſide of the queſtion. Sir William Hamilton, and ſome other curious obſervers, have formed an opinion, that the earth has undergone ſome great change by fire: and, what is remarkable, they draw their concluſions from the confines of theſe very mountains. They thought them the very beſt places for inquiry. Had they gone to Hindoſtan, they might probably have been better informed.

I do not therefore know what to think concerning this argument founded upon *high* and *low*: nor does it ſeem quite clear to me, that truth depends upon ſuch chance circumſtances. The author ſeems to imagine, that it is local: and that like the barometer, it riſes and falls in proportion to its elevation. This puts me in mind of ſomething ſimilar in another place; where he mentions language as the barometer of men's manners. p. 2. The thought is uncommon, and ingenious: and yet I think, if we go ſo far as to make language a barometer, we may with equal propriety ſtile reaſon an air-pump, and fancy a whirligig: In the mean time he has forgot, that the hiſtory of the deluge originated in Armenia, and about Ararat: which is as high ground, if that be of any conſequence, as any about Delly or Lahor. But, as I ſaid before, I know not how to perſuade myſelf, that truth depends upon ſituation. The argument appears to me in ſome degree precarious. I remember, a few years ago, that an honeſt ſailor was ſeduced into a houſe of ill fame; and carried up to one of the Atticks in Drury Lane; where he was plundered, and very near loſing his life. The people concerned were tried for the robbery; and the ſailor in the courſe of examination was among other things aſked, how he could ſuffer himſelf to be

be decoyed up three pair of ſtairs. Lord, Sir, ſays he, I thought there was as much honeſty up three pair, as up two: I knew no difference.—He ſeems to have reaſoned well: and I ſhould think, that the converſe of his argument may be fairly admitted. For I ſhould imagine, in reſpect to the preſent queſtion, that there was as much truth on the ground-floor as in the garret: in the vale of Eſher as upon Teneriffe. But the learned author is of a different opinion: for he thinks, that truth cannot come from a flat. He therefore imagines that the man in the boat has no more to do with the deluge than the man in the moon: and this, becauſe the Nile riſes; and people muſt neceſſarily have been loſt in it. Theſe emblems therefore and ceremonies all relate to drowned perſons.

He now proceeds to a new head of inquiry. *The next point, in relation to the Cuthite or Amonian worſhip of the ſun and fire, I ſhall conſider with more attention: as the ſtrongeſt arguments ſeem to ſpring from the ſubject to demonſtrate the uſefulneſs of the Arabic and Perſian languages. To make the ſubſequent obſervations more intelligible, it will be proper to give two extracts from the author's preface; which will fully ſhow the groundwork of his ingenious hypotheſis.* I wiſh, he had gone a little farther for the *groundwork*: but however—two extracts are accordingly given from preface p. 7. and 15; of my firſt volume: the firſt of which begins in the following manner.—*It is neceſſary for me to acquaint the reader, that the wonderful people, to whom I allude, were the deſcendants of Chus, and called Cuthites, and Cuſeans. They ſtood their ground at the general migration of families: but were at laſt ſcattered over the face of the whole earth*, &c. At the cloſe of theſe extracts he makes the following obſervations upon them. *Thus has this learned gentleman created*

a people to fill up every chaſm of high antiquity: and to account for all the phænomena of early population, hiſtory, and ſuperſtition. As the ſacred writers afford no lights to trace the wanderings of this extraordinary family; and as all the gleanings from profane tradition might with equal force in the ſame ingenious hands prove Confucius to be William the Conqueror: his proofs à priori ſeem to amount to nothing: the great weight of his evidence reſting chiefly on the ground of etymological deduction. This is a very melancholy and very alarming account: I am got upon a lee ſhore; and as the ſailors ſay, how I ſhall claw off, I do not know. In the firſt place, in reſpect to the Cuthites, he tells me, that they are a people of my own creating. In this I muſt have been greatly deceived: for I really thought, that they were ready made to my hands. They were the ſons of Chus: and ſeemed to occur very plainly in the Scriptures, and likewiſe in profane authors: where they are to be found under different appellations; but particularly that of Ethiopians. We have been told from different writers—Χως Αιθιοψ. Χως, εξ ου Αιθιοπες. Χως, εξ ου Χουσαιοι. Αιθιοπες ουτοι εισιν. They are mentioned by Homer and Herodotus: and almoſt by every writer who treats of the hiſtory of nations. The account, which I gave of them, was I flattered myſelf, more full, than had ever been exhibited before. It is in a manner the baſis of my ſyſtem: and takes up the greater part of my work. However if the author was not appriſed of this, it cannot be imputed to him for a fault: for if he read no farther than my 17 page of the preface, he cannot be expected to know any thing of the work itſelf. Though it muſt be confeſſed, that people, who criticiſe three bulky volumes, generally look beyond the introduction. But indeed he muſt have gone farther; and

and though he only ſkimmed the ſurface; yet he has done it with a very quick and ſagacious eye; as is manifeſt from what he has borrowed. What is ſtrange, he ſays, that I have not only *created this people*; but created them to fill up *every chaſm of high antiquity*. He looks upon them as ſo many fagots at a muſter: which are made ſubſtitutes for every abſentee. Yet I do not ſee, how the Cuthite Ethiopians can be ſo aptly ſuited and in ſo general a manner. The Family of the Fagots are of all times; and of all countries. They may fill up a gap either in the regiment of Provence or Picardy, in the Coldſtream, or the Train-bands: or in the Immortals of Xerxes, and Darius. But the family of the Cuthites was more limited: They may not be ſo eaſily adapted to ſupply a chaſm in the dynaſty of Hou-Fang of China: or in the anceſtry of Senacharib of Aſſyria, or of Bladud the ſon of Hudibras king of Britain: for there may have ſubſiſted no relation nor connexion between them and theſe princes. The author denies not only the exiſtence of this people, but alſo their diſperſion: which latter circumſtance is rather unneceſſary. For if they never exiſted, I believe, it will be readily allowed, that they were never diſperſed. *However*, ſays he, *as the ſacred writings afford no light to trace the wanderings of this extraordinary family*, &c. Now I really thought, that the Scriptures did take notice both of the Cuthites, and of this event. It is ſaid by Moſes, that Chus begat ſeveral children and among them Nimrod, who built Babel. And it is farther ſaid, that thoſe, who built Babel, the friends, and aſſociates of Nimrod, were diſperſed: *The Lord—did ſcatter them over the face of the whole earth.* Geneſ. c. 11. v. 9. Still further traces we have of them in other hiſtories. But the learned author will not allow of any

ſuch evidence; nor my reaſonings from it. For he ſays, *that all my gleanings from profane tradition might with equal force in the ſame ingenious hands prove Confucius to have been William the Conquerour: therefore my proofs à priori amount to nothing.* The concluſion is very extraordinary: for it was really hitherto a ſecret to me, that I had ever made uſe of this argument. But upon a nearer inſpection it is plain, that the author takes the argument à priori to be a deduction from paſt events: and to conſiſt, to uſe his own words, *in the gleanings from profane tradition.* This to be ſure is contrary to the common notions of moſt logical writers. But upon this we muſt not inſiſt: as ſyſtems change: and the mode of reaſoning alters. The ſignification of words likewiſe varies continually. Do not, ſays a Phyſician of my acquaintance, diſcloſe this ill news too abruptly to the lady: let it be opened to her by degrees. O, undoubtedly, ſays a ſpruce journeyman of an Apothecary; I will do it, ſir, in terrorem. By this he certainly meant *in the moſt mild and gentle manner.* It is therefore very idle to cavil about words: for if we arrive at the purport, it ſignifies little by what means. When a letter of importance comes to hand, who troubles himſelf, whether it be by the Dunſtable bag, or his Majeſty's courier? I have therefore not a word to ſay againſt the argument à priori. If we then ſet theſe little niceties aſide, we ſhall find the ultimate to be, that no foreign evidence is to be allowed. It is contraband; and at beſt but a kind of ſmuggling: and attended, we are told, with no advantage. From whence this corollary ſeems naturally to follow: *The more we ſearch, the leſs we know; and truth depends not upon information.* But this, I believe, will not be allowed.

He

He is pleaſed to take notice of my ingenious hands, which it ſeems can make contradictions plauſible. And here, gentle reader, you muſt for ſome time have ſeen, what I have perceived to my ſorrow, that all thoſe fine compliments made to me at the beginning have been long ſince evaporating, and are at laſt totally annihilated. To uſe the author's own words upon another occaſion, *give them their full force, and they amount preciſely to nothing.* I am ſaid to be unfortunately led *by the ear and the eye.* The *penetration* ſo kindly mentioned turns out a penetration without inſight. *The judgment* allotted me proves a ſeries of fundamental miſtakes: and the *new and informing light* is a mere ignis fatuus, by which I have deceived myſelf, and bewildered others. The whole is attended with *a warmth of fancy devoted to the marvellous:* and even this laſt compliment of *ingenuity*, though pleaſing and conſolatory, amounts to little: for it is repreſented as a kind of legerdemain, and ſcarcely preferable to that of Breſlaw, or Comus. But let us turn from this diſagreeable retroſpect. The author adds, that *the great weight of my evidence reſts chiefly upon the ground of etymological deduction.* This was far from my intention: and I thought, that the ſtate of the caſe had been quite otherwiſe. Indeed at the end of my etymological inquiries I had the forecaſt to put in a caveat: and it was there mentioned that the hiſtory, which was to enſue, was quite ſeparate and independent. And this, I believe, is evident to every body, who has conſidered what I have written. But here the author is juſtly to be acquitted, for, as I have obſerved before, if he never read my work, he cannot be anſwerable for the purport. He kindly adds, that *as this is the ſtation, which he* (the author of the Analyſis) *has choſen, it could have been wiſhed—that*

the definitions of his elementary particles had been preciſely fixed: that the languages, whence he has drawn the meanings, he has annexed, had been diſtinctly ſpecified: and that no doubt had been left upon the reader's mind. I ſincerely wiſh the ſame: but it is difficult to ſatisfy all the world. Some cannot ſee: others will not: and there are none ſo deaf as thoſe, who will not hear. And here I muſt obſerve, that what I mention as a root, or element; the learned author ſtiles a particle. This may be very proper: for, as I before obſerved, words are taken *in terrorem*; that is in different acceptations. But it ſhould ſeem, that this uſage ought not to be indiſcriminately followed: for with the ſame latitude the names of perſons may be called prefixes: and titles ſtiled expletives: which would be an affront to thoſe, who are bleſſed with them. As for verbs and participles they might dwindle to commas and ſemicolons. It therefore ſeems proper, that upon this point we proceed with ſome caution.

Before I quit this ſubject it is neceſſary to mention one or two circumſtances, which have pretty much embarraſſed me: as they are attended with conſequences, which I cannot reconcile. The author ſpeaking of the Cuthites, ſays, that they are an ideal people of my own creating, formed only to ſtop up a gap. A page or two before he takes notice of their worſhip, and tells us, *that the ſtrongeſt arguments ſeem naturally to ſpring from this ſubject to demonſtrate the uſefulneſs of the Arabic and Perſian languages.* Concerning the utility of theſe languages I make no doubt; but how it can be proved from hence ſeems to me a paradox. For if there were no ſuch people, as the Cuthites, there could not be ſuch worſhip: and this demonſtration muſt be founded on a mere negative; a non-entity.

Again;

Again: if I am ſo fundamentally miſtaken, as repreſented; ſo led by the eye and the ear: how came the author to borrow ſo largely from me: for he has certainly copied a great deal? And here I cannot help putting a query, as there is ſo much appropriated from me, whether it ſhould not have been more openly acknowledged. I only juſt hint it among friends, whether it would not have had a better appearance to have declared it above board and immediately to the public. To be ſure, ſomething of this ſort may be found in the notes at the end, where he ſays, that *he ſhould be uncandid, if he did not acknowledge, that he had derived much information from writers, whom he had criticiſed; and from none more than from Mr. Bryant, D'Herbelote, and Hyde.* In reſpect to my two aſſociates, and to others, this may be ſufficient. But as he has traduced me more, than he has any other perſon; and borrowed from me far more largely than from others, it appears to my judgment, that ſomething more was requiſite. It coſt me much labour to give an account of the Argonautic Expedition, and in making my obſervations upon it: and I believe a more particular and copious hiſtory of it was never exhibited before. The whole of this nearly to the amount of four pages the author has adopted; and for the moſt part in my own words. Many other extracts of conſequence are alſo taken from me: and this without any immediate notice, that ſuch extracts are borrowed. It may perhaps be ſaid, that if I had read my author, or read him with any attention, I ſhould have ſeen a reference to a note, where ſuch intimation is given. And now upon a nearer inſpection I do ſee at the cloſe of the paragraph an almoſt imperceptible letter, which denotes ſuch a reference. But why is this information placed at the end of the treatiſe, and trans-

ferred to a note? When the author in polite terms calls me to an account my name ſtands boldly expoſed to all the world: and is repeated through ſeveral pages. Should he not, when he borrowed from me, have introduced me in the ſame manner? He might have made his acknowledgments openly in ſo many words: or have printed the paſſages in italics. Many readers do not turn to notes: ſo that he will have the credit of the obſervations: if any credit there be. Or if they do turn to the place, it will afford them no great light. My name is mentioned: but whether to good or bad purpoſe cannot be ſeen. Much leſs can it be known how much or how little is borrowed. Sometimes my name is not at all mentioned: at other times it is ſo loſt in a crowd of other authors, that it is impoſſible to know, from whom the ſeries of evidence [1] is taken. All this I mention for the ſake of my learned friend: for the whole to me is of little conſequence: it ſtands me very little in ſtead, whether I am placed in front, or in rear, or reduced to a fagot at a muſter. And yet after all, I do not know, whether I am not too delicate in finding fault with this new mode of writing, where all additional notices and obligations are placed by themſelves at the end of the book. It certainly preſerves the text from being overloaded; and the author has acted with great propriety in preſenting his lighter fare, and entremets immediately to our option: and placing, what is more groſs and ſubſtantial at a diſtance. He knew well, that at polite tables, the chine and ſurloin are ever baniſhed to the ſideboard. His manœuvre in reſpect to the diſpoſition of his evidence is like that of a great general, who beſides a forlorn hope has always a corps de

[1] See p. 33. 45. 46. 68. 69. 73, and at the end of the Treatiſe, Notes to p. 8. 68. 69. 84.

reſerve

reſerve behind in caſe of any exigency. This conſiſts often of borrowed troops, and foreign ſoldiers, in whom however he may perhaps place more confidence, than in his own: and whoſe merits and ſervices he very properly takes to himſelf. This method of removing things ſo far backward prevents alſo a deal of interruption: as at this diſtance the notes may be left to be read at laſt; or not read at all. It above all things adds to the uniformity of the page, which is ſpoiled by having notes at the bottom. And in theſe times, whoever would ſucceed, muſt addreſs himſelf as much to the eye, as to the underſtanding. And though it may be uſual to place Debtor firſt, and per contra Creditor afterwards; yet it is certainly in this inſtance better to bring creditor a priori forward; and debtor a poſteriori behind. It is of no diſſervice to the reader: and ten times more pleaſing to the writer: for nemo videt id manticæ, quod a tergo eſt: which muſt be eſteemed an aphoriſm of great truth. The purport of it is this: that all bonds and obligations are cancelled, when they are *applied behind.* I do not therefore ſee, why we may not place ſome of our chief intelligence in the rear, juſt as on ſhipboard they carry lights in the poop. Here it is ſaid, that Scoggan made enquiry, when he was preſented with an horſe. He lifted up the tail, and peered under it, as thinking this the ſure place to find out his age and excellence. What ſucceſs he had, is not mentioned. Thus much, I think, is certain, that we may by a fair analogy copy him. Our learned author has indeed done it: and where Scoggan ſearched for the qualities of his horſe, he refers us for his obligations to his friends.

I come now to thoſe elements, the Radices amaræ, which my kind opponent cannot digeſt. And yet at the cloſe he ſays more in favour of them,

them, than he ever deſigned, or I expected. However the firſt ſetting off is not ſo gracious. *One great endeavour of our learned author, is to trace to his Cuthites the origin of ſolar and igneous worſhip: and in order to fix his theorem he brings forward a number of particles, which, he ſays, in ancient times ſignified the ſun, or fire. As he ſeldom mentions however, in what particular idiom they were received in thoſe ſenſes; doubts naturally ariſe. To the ſun, as a mere aſtronomical body, or to the fire, as a ſimple element, few of them appear to bear the moſt remote relation, and in any other ſenſe, deſcriptive of them, as objects of adoration, they might with equal propriety be adduced to authenticate the worſhip of the Egyptian onion, the druids oak, or the great Arabian ſtone devil in the valley of Mounah.* What a ſad reverſe I am obliged to experience here! What is become of that penetration, judgment, ability, learning, informing light, and ingenuity, with which I was bleſſed before? How do the faireſt flowers fade, and laurels wither! We have in the foregoing a heavy charge: and it conſiſts, we find, principally *in my bringing forward particles to fix a theorem: and this in order to ſhew, that theſe particles denoted the ſun or fire: which however have no more relation to the aſtronomical ſun, or fire, than an onion, or the devil.* And I am farther blamed for not mentioning the *idiom* of theſe particles. In other places the author complains, that he cannot find out, to what language I allude: and yet, what may appear ſtrange, without his knowing either idiom or language, he determines upon their ſignification; and tries to prove me fundamentally in the wrong. At other times he ſeems acquainted, not with one, but many languages, to which he ſuppoſes them to relate. *Of forty radicals one half at leaſt do not appear to approach the ſenſes, he has given them. Whilſt miſled*

miſled by his ear and his eye, he has fancied analogies, which the languages will not bear. But I want to know, how he proves this: and by what ſtandard he proceeds. Why he tries them by the Arabic and Perſian languages: and if they do not accord, he thinks, that they are neceſſarily wrong. This ſurely is a very ſevere teſt: yet contrary to his purpoſe, I think it will prove greatly in my favour. For there is part of the allegation above very remarkable, and to which it will be worth our while carefully to attend. It is there ſaid of the radicals produced by me, *half at leaſt* do not come up to the meaning, which I aſſign. From hence we muſt neceſſarily conclude, that the remainder do anſwer, and come up to the meaning. As he mentions *half at leaſt*, we will for charity's ſake throw a ſmall weight into the lighter ſcale to bring it to an equipoiſe: and ſuppoſe them in round numbers half. And if this really be the caſe, I will compromiſe the affair, and gladly give up the other half without any diſpute: for this conceſſion is ſufficiently in my favour. But this is not all. Many have thought that theſe elementary words, of which I gave a ſpecimen, were merely ideal: the offspring of fancy. Now the author tells us, that they are almoſt all to be found in the Arabian and Perſic languages: and nearly half in the acceptation, which I have given them: which is a circumſtance of great conſequence to me. He accordingly gives an interpretation of them: and he adds, *that nothing more ſhews the uſefulneſs and antiquity of thoſe languages, than the unconſtrained meanings—for almoſt every radical produced by this gentleman* (the Author of the Analyſis) *for the baſis of his ſyſtem. Could this be the effect of chance?* p. 115. With my ſyſtem, as I have before obſerved, he does not ſeem to be truly acquainted: for it is founded upon very dif-

ferent

ferent principles. But in reſpect to what precedes, thus much is certain; that if the greater part of theſe radicals are to be found, where he aſſerts; *chance* could have nothing to do with it. For it was impoſſible for me at a hazard, without any knowledge of thoſe languages, to have invented a ſeries of terms, which are ſo happily found in them. And if it at all makes for the author's opinion; it likewiſe makes for me, and confirms mine. If then near half of theſe ancient terms occur in the ſenſe, which I allot to them: the other half, depend upon it, will be verified by other perſons, and in different tongues. For it is a ſevere teſt to try a ſet of ancient terms by one or two languages only; and ſuch as are ſtill in uſe: as if there were any language upon earth that had not ſuffered a change in an interval of between three and four thouſand years. If then he allows, that almoſt all of them are to be there found, and near half in the ſenſe, which I have given them; that is ſufficient for me. I cordially take him by the hand, and from my heart forgive him the imputation of my having made Confuſius William the Conqueror: or of having either inclination or power to effect it.

The learned author has often aſked from what dialect the roots, of which we have been treating are to be deduced: and in what *idiom*, they are to be found. I have endeavoured to ſhew from the beſt evidence, which I could procure, that they were from the original language of mankind, antecedent to other tongues; and even prior to dialects. But why does he put a queſtion of this kind, when it is ſo fully anſwered by himſelf? It is in a paſſage, where in a very generous manner he ſtands up in my defence againſt the invectives of the anonymous perſons in the Bibliotheca Critica from Amſterdam. The writers of which for their petulance

petulance he calls to a juſt account. Having ſpoken of my purpoſe, and referred to my preface, he adds: *Many other paſſages clearly explain his plan: and one of his chief objects is to develope ancient mythology from the obſcurity, in which the Greeks had involved it, by corrupting the channels of derivation. He endeavours therefore to penetrate to the fountain-head of language: of which he conſiders the Greek only, as a remote ſtream. His ideas on this ground are judicious.—With what propriety then can theſe gentlemen triumph, and queſtion his knowledge of the Greek, when he profeſſedly goes to a higher origin for his etymologies.*

And now, good Sir, give me leave to addreſs you more particularly; and to return you my ſincere thanks for this noble defence. Some untoward thoughts ariſe from the premiſes: but I cannot be ſo cruel, as to give them vent. It is indeed with regret, that I am obliged at all to proceed. But I believe, that you yourſelf upon cool reflection muſt think that you have gone too far: for how could my words about *the modern Perſic and Arabic* afford juſt grounds for your ſevere animadverſions? You have certainly gone out of your way, and made an unneceſſary attack: in which your zeal has carried you much beyond your mark. The work, which I ventured to produce to the world was the conſequence of much ſtudy and great labour. This you have tried to ruin. Yet I have reaſon to think, that you never read it through: and thoſe parts, which have come under your cognizance have been but partially noticed and little underſtood. You are unacquainted with the groundwork, upon which I proceed. What related at all to your department was but an inconſiderable portion of the whole; and of little conſequence; as the hiſtorical part depended not at all upon it. But

you

you have exceeded your province, and ſuffered yourſelf to be ſeduced into an unknown region: of which you ſhould have got ſome certain intelligence, before you had ventured to decry it. In the mean time you have run the hazard of hurting your own work by clogging it with ſo much extraneous matter. You have certainly been very laudably employed: and I make no doubt, but the world will be much indebted to your labours. The utility of your publication cannot be doubted: but, as I have before ſaid, you have run the hazard of injuring it by that unneceſſary detail, with which it is prefaced. Your book is chiefly calculated for the uſe of Perſons in India, to facilitate their learning the language of the country. The intention therefore is manifeſtly good: and there is reaſon to believe, that the whole is well executed. But how does my work relate to it: and what are my opinions to the preſent purpoſe? Be they right, or wrong, how can they concern a perſon at Patna or Chardanagora: at Decca or Bombay? Certainly not in the leaſt. Your forcing me upon the ſtage, and traducing my writings, can never be a recommendation of your own; nor of any emolument to thoſe, for whom they are deſigned. At the ſame time I ſhould be ſorry to have it a detriment: for I am not unacquainted with your labour and attention in the proſecution of your purpoſe: and ſo little does any illwill tranſport me, and ſo far am I from impeaching your work, that I ſincerely think, it merits great encouragement, and ſhould be in every library of conſequence. It is with pleaſure, I read at the cloſe of your treatiſe, that you purpoſe to proceed farther. And as you ſay, that there are ſtores of Perſic literature, it is to be wiſhed that you would preſent the world with ſome of the hiſtories from that country; ſuch as may appear the moſt

ancient,

ancient, and of the greateſt conſequence. But at the ſame time let me beg of you not to be offended, if I give you a friendly caution. Believe me, my good Sir, you write too much in a hurry. Your gooſe-quill ſeems quite animated; and abſolutely runs away with you. In conſequence of this you often in a long-winded ſentence forget the point in view, with which you ſet out. You indeed terminate boldly and roundly: but, though there is a great deal ſaid, yet there is little expreſſed. Let us take for an inſtance the very beginning of your diſſertation: p. 1. where you are ſpeaking of *the manners of men.* Theſe, you ſay, *muſt ever form an intereſting inquiry:* a point, which we will not diſpute. You then proceed upon the ſame head, and tell us—*In every age and climate they* (the manners of men) *diſplay a wonderful diverſity of character: and exhibit a picture ſo variouſly coloured, that we are convinced by experience alone, that the great original of the whole is man.* But ſurely you muſt be very hard to be convinced, if this be the caſe: for to me the affair ſeems ſelf-evident. If the manners of men exhibit a picture, let the picture be as various, as you pleaſe, yet it muſt originate in man. There is no need of any train of inferences, nor a ſeries of experimental knowledge, to convince us of this: for the whole, as I ſaid before, is ſelf-evident: no axiom can be plainer. In like manner the paſſions of men may be ſaid to exhibit a picture: but that picture muſt have the ſame object for its original, as the paſſions, which it deſcribes. The countenances, and features, of men may alſo afford a picture: and a very ridiculous one, if they are properly choſen, and contraſted; as we find them to have been in many inſtances by that ingenious artiſt Callot. But who upon ſeeing thoſe groups of chins and noſes and blubber lips ever doubted, to

what

what being they belonged? who ever waited for a long experience to find out, *that the great original of the whole is man?* In ſhort, if I may ſpeak my mind, you ſeem to be rather too rhetorical: and do not ſufficiently regard logic; a grain, or two, of which is of great conſequence. You likewiſe make uſe of a figure common among modern writers, which an ingenious and learned friend of mine calls *the ſuſpended progreſſion.* It conſiſts in making great advances without getting a ſtep forward. A perſon ſeems to be carried on; yet after a little hurry of ſpirits, and a few giddy evolutions, he is diſmiſſed juſt, where he ſet out. Nothing can better explain it than the operation of the Catulus culinarius, ſive canis εν περιτροχιῳ Bathonienſium: which we find thus expreſſed by the poet.

——Orbiculo fertur revolutus eodem:
Progrediturque retro præceps, ſcanditque deorſum.

Permit me likewiſe to adviſe you to avoid in your preliminary diſcourſes all extraneous matter: and above all things not to meddle with the writers of Greece. If you remember, you call me to a ſevere account for my boldneſs in ſpeaking of the modern Perſic: and I muſt own myſelf to have been an unfortunate delinquent. You ſay very rightly, *that there appears an impropriety in any perſon's condemning what he does not underſtand.* This leads me to a quere, which I forgot to make: and which with your permiſſion I will mention now. You apply very familiarly to various Grecian authors; and give your opinion about them, as if they were your intimate acquaintance. But be pleaſed, my good Sir, to tell me ingenuouſly, did you ever read five lines in any of them: or are you at all acquainted with the language, in which they

they wrote. I am ſenſible, that you ſpeak with great eaſe of Strabo, Diodorus, and Plutarch: and you treat the more remote hiſtorians, ſuch as Beroſus, Abydenus, Sanchoniathon, as if you had perſonally known them. But familiarity does not prove acquaintance. It is a common thing for people to pretend to a correſpondence with perſons of the firſt rank: and to claim an intimacy, where they are the greateſt ſtrangers. I remember being formerly in ſome neighbouring gardens, when a noted empirick was haranguing a large circle of his ragged admirers, and recommending his pill. Many coaches with people of conſequence paſſed by: but none unnoticed. To ſome he bowed: to others he kiſſed his hand: and to ſeveral he only nodded and ſmiled. Among others there came one carriage more ſplendid than the reſt with a ducal coronet: which happened to be empty. But that did not ſignify. The doctor availing himſelf of the opportunity pulled off his hat; and made a moſt reſpectful bow. Then recovering himſelf with a ſmile, *You ſee*, ſays he, *that I know him; and I know them all. They are my faſt friends, every mother's ſon of them, I can aſſure ye, my boys.* And yet there was reaſon to think, that he did not ſo much as know the man upon the coach-box. I mention this to ſhew, that there may be great familiarity without the leaſt acquaintance.

You favour the Perſian hiſtorians; and perhaps very juſtly. Yet I ſometimes have apprehended, that you may hurt your own cauſe by the principles, upon which you try to eſtabliſh it. For when you contraſt the Perſian writers with thoſe of Greece, you ſeem to found their merit on mere negatives; which ſome may look upon as capital deficiences. You accordingly tell us p. 42. 3. that there is no mention made of Cyrus the Great;

nor of Croeſus; nor of the kingdom of Lydia being annexed to that of Perſia. There is moreover no account of Smerdis Magnus; nor of Darius the ſon of Hyſtaſpes: nor does the name of Cyrus the younger occur in the catalogue, which you give. Conſequently the expedition under Clearchus, and the return of the ten thouſand under Xenophon are not to be found. *Not a veſtige*, ſay you, *is to be diſcovered of the famous battles of Marathon, Thermopylæ, Salamis, Platæa, or Mycale*: all which, I fear, will not make in favour of your hiſtorians. As they are therefore ſilent about ſo many events, pray, what information is there, for which we may be beholden to them? Why they tell us, you ſay, p. 45. that the Grecians ſo far from having had any advantages over the Perſians were in reality tributaries to them; and their ſtates under contribution: p. 45. That Philip of Macedon was likewiſe dependant upon the ſame people: that he had been defeated in Macedonia by Darius; and payed annually *a thouſand golden eggs*. p. 49. Laſtly, what is very extraordinary, and little thought of, that Alexander the Great was a Perſian, the ſon of Darius Codomannus: the ſame prince, whom he defeated, and ſucceeded. ibid. After having mentioned theſe great contrarieties, you try with much ſkill to balance accounts; and ſeem at laſt to come to this compromiſe: viz.—That you lean towards the Perſian detail in reſpect *to the general idea*: but *in many circumſtances you incline to the Greeks*. p. 52. Upon this determination I ſhall make no comment: much leſs ſhall I preſume to ſay any thing to its diſadvantage. For I am determined to obſerve the golden rule, which you have been pleaſed to lay down—*that there is an impropriety in a perſon's condemning what he confeſſedly does not underſtand.*

You have mentioned *my novel ingenuity*; and that *I ſhew a warmth of fancy highly prepared for every thing marvellous.* Now this is the very quality, which I have all along admired in you: and it is cruel to cenſure me, where I give you commendation. For your fort is certainly the marvellous. Nobody deals oftener, or more happily, in extraordinary narrations than yourſelf. One inſtance of this may, I think, be ſeen in your account of the library of a particular Arab grammarian, whoſe dictionaries alone came to ſixty camels load. Now a camel's burden according to Shaw is ſeven quintals, or hundreds: at which rate the quantity of dictionaries amounted to twenty-one tun. If the man's learning was equal to his library, Ariſtotle muſt have been a fool to him.

Permit me to quote from you another inſtance of the wonderful in the hiſtory of Emir Iſmael, who could not diſcover the treaſure of Amron Leïs. N. p. 150. 2. It ſeems, that *one of the emir's female ſlaves, undreſſing to bathe on the terras of the palace, laid down her girdle, ſet with large rubies on a white cloth. A hungry kite, obſerving, and ſuppoſing the red ſtones to be bits of meat, pounced upon the girdle, and carried it off.* Nota bene. Theſe rubies, which the ſlave wore, muſt have been very large to have been taken by a bird of prey for bits of meat: and I ſhould have thought, that a kite was by nature too ſagacious to have been thus deceived. When Dr. John Baldero was maſter of a college in Cambridge, he one day found his ſtaircaſe very much dirtied; and taxed a ſcholar with it: who told him, that it was done by the raven in the court. Ay, ay, ſays old John, I gueſs, what ſort of a raven did it: it was a two-legged raven. He would probably have ſtiled this a two-legged kite. I dare ſay it was one of John Baldero's

breed. But I am wrong to interrupt the ſtory. *The bird carried off the girdle. The damſel inſtantly gave the alarm, to the guard: and a number of horſemen were diſpatched to keep the kite in view: who dropt it after a long purſuit: when it fell into a well. A man was immediately let down; who diſcovered in the ſide a large cavity, where a vaſt number of cheſts had been lodged, which proved to be the very treaſure, which the emir had been in queſt of; and amounted to four millions ſterling.* This is the firſt time, I believe, that a body of horſe was ſent after a kite: and though the horſes of Perſia are very fleet; yet it is extraordinary in *a long purſuit* that they ſhould be able to keep up with a bird ſo ſwift, which had likewiſe got ſome minutes the ſtart of them. But the moſt ſurpriſing circumſtance is, as the aperture of a well cannot be above a yard or two in diameter, that in ſo wide a range the kite ſhould ſo exactly hit this mark: and of all places in ſo large a circuit let the girdle drop into this well. And laſt of all, which crowns the whole, that here ſhould be the long ſought for treaſure, worth four millions ſterling. We ſee here a wonderful concurrence of circumſtances: and there are people, who will think, that they approach very near to the *marvellous*.

The ſtory, p. 5. concerning the envoy, who was ſent to the Tobba of Arabia, is equally extraordinary and entertaining. The prince, it ſeems, upon the envoy being introduced ſaid to him, T'heb, *be ſeated*. But this, in the dialect of the perſon ſpoken to, unluckily ſignified—*precipitate yourſelf*: which proved an unfortunate circumſtance. For the poor envoy, *with a ſingular deference for the orders of his ſovereign*, went and threw himſelf from the wall of the caſtle, and broke his neck. Now the commands of princes ought without doubt to be heeded:

heeded: yet I believe in this caſe few would have ſhewn ſuch *ſingular deference* at ſo ſudden warning. One ſhould think, that a perſon would have heſitated a little, and have made ſome ſmall inquiry before he had ventured all for nothing. In later times a ſenſible man may have ſhewn a miſtaken regard; and have been led into an errour: but hardly into one ſo fatal, as that mentioned above. However there have been facts ſomewhat ſimilar: and as nothing ſets off a hiſtory to ſuch advantage, as its parallel, accept what follows by way of illuſtration: for the preciſe truth of which I will not vouch: but give it you as I receive it. The perſon concerned is ſuppoſed to have been, like the man above, an envoy: one, who reſided here in the reign of Queen Elizabeth: but of what country is not ſaid: though from his great politeneſs ſome judgment may perhaps be formed. He is repreſented as very infirm, and gouty: and at the ſame time troubled with a painful retention. The MSS. in which he is mentioned, deſcribes him in the following manner. *He was a very aged, and a very coſtive Lord: and ſo marred in his knees and in his ancles with the gout, that he could ſcant ſtond. One day, when he was in Privy Chamber, the Queen's Majeſtie noting his infirmities, ſayd unto him: Good my Lord, I wiſh, that you could procure yourſelf a ſtool. He not truly apprehending her Grace's meaning through default of language, but thinking of his private malady, went incontinent home: and took ſo many laxatives, enemas, and cathartics, that he was well nigh killed. And though they gave him Hippocraſs, and many cordial apozems, yet from Allhallowtide to Saint Swithin his bowels were like a bladder. Nor did they recover themſelves in a year, they were ſo angered and aggrieved.* Whatever miſtake may have been made, we ſee here the utmoſt complaiſance:

ſance: and this too, let me tell you, in very critical circumſtances. Nothing could be more proper, than the regard ſhewn to the ſuppoſed good wiſhes of a princeſs; whoſe wiſhes were eſteemed equal to commands. But I muſt confeſs, when a regard of this ſort is extended to hanging or drowning, or to breaking one's neck, it ſeems to be carried rather too far. And whatever ſenſe of duty a perſon may entertain, yet I ſhould imagine, that he would think twice, before he implicitly obeyed: for a leap down a precipice is no jeſting matter. In good truth, if I may be allowed to ſpeak freely, hiſtories of this ſort are very little ſuperior to thoſe of that reſpectable lady, Mother Gooſe. On this account I ſhould imagine, that in your future publications they had better be omitted, leſt the Perſians ſhould be eſteemed as great fablers as the Greeks. As to the account (p. 147. notes) of the Nim Iuzé, this I allow to be curious; and it is of a different caſt. I beg therefore to repeat it in your own words, for I am far from having any thing to ſay to its diſparagement. *One of the moſt ſingular creatures (in Arabia) is the Nim Iuzé, or Nim Cheir. It is ſuppoſed to be a human figure ſplit in two: the male being the right half, and the female the left. They have of conſequence half a face, one eye, one arm, and one foot; on which they run with incredible ſwiftneſs.* There is humour in this: and I only wiſh, that one of the halves had been ſent after the kite, that ſtole the maid's girdle; it would have beat the Perſian ſcouts all hollow.

And now, good ſir, give me leave in the moſt amicable manner to conclude. You took notice in a particular paſſage, that you thought it your duty to defend the merits of the Perſian and Arabian languages. You cannot but think me under an equal obligation to ſtand up for my own writings.

I hope

I hope therefore, that what I have ſaid, will be taken in good part. You have certainly in ſome inſtances nearly cancelled the kind compliments, which you made me: but in general you have behaved with very great politeneſs. Your ſtanding up in my defence againſt the perſons who traduced me abroad, does as much honour to yourſelf, as to me: and lays me under an obligation, which I ſhall be always ready to acknowledge. Though I may have ſmiled at your borrowing from me, and placing your references in the rear: yet I am very happy, that there was any thing worth your taking. Indeed I am under other obligations to you beſide the above. As there are ſeveral copies of my Analyſis ſtill remaining in the bookſeller's hands, nobody writes againſt me, but what ſome of them go off. Mr. Barrington did me the honour to call me to an account; I ſuppoſe not leſs than twenty copies went upon the occaſion. The Dean of Exeter made ſome kind ſtrictures both upon me and Mr. Barrington: this carried off about the ſame number. Anonymous benefited me by about fifteen. Another Anonymous ten: Ditto eight. My friends of Amſterdam not quite ſo many. When I was in town ſome weeks ago Mr. Elmſly (whoſe zeal for his author can never be ſufficiently admired) took me aſide, and ſhewed me the very Diſſertation, upon which we have been dwelling ſo largely. It came out, ſays he, but yeſterday; and I ſold two of your copies laſt night; and one this morning. He then added with a whiſper,—*If they abuſe you much longer, we muſt have a third edition.*

FINIS.

BRITISH MUSEUM 24 NOV 53